Dear Jim,

4/12/86

Early this morning, before this little fever I have tired me too much, I read the Gilday papers and the Rivle report you gave me yesterday. I made a few notes and will later be writing you based on them. But I do not want to forget a few things. One is that Rivle's crap ought be titled, "Join Bud Fensterwald and see the world- all expenses paid," rather than a "report." You say he is a novelist, at Tolstoian length. There is no other relationship to Tolstoy, and he may well be developing the materials for a couple of other novels, if he is not a fool, one on drugs and the other on Bud's foolishness and extravagences. In short, where he is not utterly irrelevant, which in most of the time, he lacks credibility, includes no confirmation, is ignorant and flaunts it (possibly because he knows he is feeding back what Bud wants) and thus is not uneasy about it), and he makes no effort to include any kind of confirmation- of anything that has any relevance. All he does is propose more travel for himself, I assume at Bud's expense. He includes much about drugs traffic and Tshombe, I presume because he knows it will titilate and interest, and even assuming that this, too, is not fictional, what in the world is its possible relevance?

Don't you people ever ask yourselves any questions in these affairs? Lawyers who don't even think of trying to be their own devil's advocates? (and I guess I now know about your trip to France, which caused you to hurry on a filing that was more worthy of attention. I hope you enjoyed yourself because if you didn't all you did is waste your time and engage in further self-deception, the latter in the plural.)

Gilday may have taken more time. I assume it cost much less. In any event, it amounts to nothing at all as it stands. It all could have come from what is public domain and I'm inclined to believe does, that it is baseless. I have substanital questions about it. Not his criminal record but just plain reasonableness: do people act this way? Would a Colson in the White House meet with petty thieves and would Caulfield and Tony U refer these criminal to the official spookeries? Even with good and dependable friends there, I doubt it very much. Meanwhile, in what you gave me to read, Gilday doesn't even suggest that he gave them anything of any value, but the more meaningless his stuff the more excited the Nixon gang supposedly grew and the more they trusted Gilday. Colson the lawyer and the others, professional cops, could not possibly have behaved as Gilday describes.

Before taking a nap, I remind you again that some time ago, after going over similar such stuff, I suggested that Bud come up and try some of them out on me before he got himself and so much money invested in what at best are futilities and he agreed. And hasn't.

In the memo titled "The Gilday Story," on page 2, his tale of how he got money and how he left a tape for them comes right from the Watergate testimony, with a slight alteration that further reduces its credibility. Nobody in his right mind would just abandon a paper bag with money in it where anyone could pick it up and he wouldn't depend on getting a tape back in the same bag. Once Caulfield and Tony U. (Allegedly) had a personal meeting with Gilday there was no reason to fear any other personal meetings. I can't imagine Colson meeting with such characters when he already has his cutouts and I can't imagine the people in the professional spookeries running any risk like any of the many involved in dealing with entirely unknown sources. Huston's name also was well publicized and (p.3) I can't imagine that Colson would show them a Huston memo on the domestic inteelligence operation all of them were, necessarily, keeping so secret. It is impossible to believe that these Nixon people would have talked to him about, leave alone trusted him for a "hit" of any kind, and least likely of all would have been making another Kennedy martyr, which would have hurt the GOPs, among other things. His letter is without any real meaning and there is none that can be attributed to the miscellaneous handwritten notations all of which, like everything else attributed to him, was publicly available. And if genuine could have had other meaning.

All of this is devoid of not only any confirmation but any effort at it and thus it has the marks of a "con! job.

It likewise is unreasonable to believe that Colson and the others would have had anything at all to do with any criminal in any way connected with the Weathermen and their crimes. Nor is there any reason to believe that the only way Gilray had of knowing of the various places mentioned is this thin and incredible business. The pictures attached also mean nothing because they could have been obtained easily or taken for entirely different purposes.

I thought you'd once mentioned he claimed JFK assassination knowledge. If so, no indication of it in what you gave me and I'd trust it even less now if he provided anything like that.

Rivle's 2/25/86 report refers to an earlier one I've not seen. He did not number the pages so I have, from the front, for ready reference.

P. 2- less than two weeks before the assassination (later lengthened) does not leave nearly enough time for planning the JFK assassination, particularly not for foreigners. There was too much to learn, check and arrange for. And when in addition Christian David refers to a meeting with a representative of the Chicago mafia I am immediately suspicious. I am even more suspicious when he claims he had a meeting with and got a warning from Dan Mitrione (safely dead), who was engaged in an entirely different kind of work, training Latin American police to torture and get information by means of torture. Also other police niceties. And it makes no sense to be afraid of getting killed by sppoks (or others) in the U.S. but not afraid of this in Mexico. (This is under Rivle's first meeting with David and what follows is under the second.) When David involves the CIA in the killing of Oswald I have and all of you, too, should have had, the gravest doubts about him and anything he says. And there is no likely hood at all that it would kill David "in the same way," his alleged fear.

In the third meeting David said that Satri fired from the ~~bright~~ bridge in the JFK assassination. Are you people so anxious for excitement or whatever else you get from these associations from not particularly clever con men that you, particularly Rivle, are unaware that more than a dozen people, plus a couple of cops, were on that bridge at that very moment. It also was impossible (p.3) to have "worked out mathematically how to set up the crossfire" because JFK's route was not known in confirmed detail and because what had been published was contradictory, different routes at that point.

Fourth meeting (p. 4) includes an account of the assassination that is impossible, "you can't understand the wounds if you don't realize that one gun was low,' almost horizontal.'" Shades of Kurtz! Even from the front his was physically impossible. How much do you people need before you get turned off and realize you are being conned?

When Rivle (page 5) describes Tony Summers' occupation as "beloved celebrity," that is pretty far out and it is hardly credentials. Tony says that Cuebela is in Madrid. I prefer to believe Castro, who says he has him confined in a mental hospital. And when I see a description of anyone as "of Lake Pontchartrain arsenal fame" I know this is phony because, among other things, there was no arsenal of any kind there and none at or on the lake. This, obviously, comes from what was published. And how could the Marseilles chief of police "find a name of Frenchy" when it didn't exist and was invented by Bud's friend Dick Sprague? (This is what happens to all the fictions so many are so anxious to believe, they are believed when they are fed back, without any kind of authentication existing or in this formulation even possible.) When Rivle knows so little about the crime and what was published how can Bud bring himself to finance and trust him? (The subsequent Frenchy i.d.s are also fictional, without exception.

P. 7 (and 11,13 and 16) Rivle doesn't even know the name of the French spookery, which he repeatedly gives as SNDECE rather than SDECE. Didn't he pronounce it or hear it spoken? Here and throughout there is much on gangsters and drugs that, whether or

true, is not shown to have any relevance. The reason is obvious: there is none. So it is meaningless, at best.

P. 11, David says that only Sarti had an explosive bullet and again, this comes from the Garrison crap that was published, not fact. The known info on the wounds eliminates the possibility that an explosive bullet was used. It also is not reasonable to believe that three Corsicans were the assassins, with all the liabilities attaching to foreigners, who are conspicuous, and who lacked the local knowledge required, particularly for getting away. Even if fluent in English they'd be too conspicuous.

P. 14, under "Recommendations," do you people swallow and hold down anything at all? He recommends locating someone under the DJ's protected witness program. Do you know anything (and necessarily) more secret?

15, under Dodard testimony, I started to make a note and didn't and at this point it isn't worth the time. I'm distressed that grown men so deceive and mislead themselves and spend valuable time as well as not inconsiderable sums of money on such awful and obviously worthless stuff and people. How in the world Bud latched on to a novelist to use as an investigator may be more interesting than all this rubbish from him.

Harold